

But when we talk about a nongovernmental organization, if this nongovernmental organization does not take the money, another will step up to the plate and procure the grant.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman if it is fungible in the case of Israel?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not think so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, today, of course, we are considering H.R. 4811, the fiscal year 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill, and I rise in strong opposition to the amendment at hand.

This bill includes language carried over from last year's bill, as has already been discussed. This language was a carefully crafted compromise which limits the amount of funding that can be distributed to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions overseas. This amount was capped at \$15 million. Of course, that is \$15 million more than we would like to have seen; however, the agreement prevented hundreds of millions of dollars more from going into the abortion industry.

The compromise also transfers \$12.5 million to child survival programs if the President approves any U.S. subsidies for foreign abortion providers or promoters. This transfer would have the direct tangible effect of saving the lives of children around the world through immunization and oral rehydration therapy. These measures would prevent or treat diseases that currently take the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent children every year.

The proposed amendment would strike this language and allow up to \$1.3 billion in U.S. funds to flow freely to the international abortion industry. This is of great concern to me personally, and I believe that it should not be allowed. Economic development and health care are how to help families in other countries, not the funding of groups that have performed abortions in the name of birth control.

I sincerely request my colleagues to join with me today in opposing this amendment and reaffirming the Mexico City policy compromise that we agreed to and passed into law last year. The language currently in the bill will save the lives of countless children around the world, both born and unborn.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), one of my colleagues who was also on that trip to India and saw the abject conditions that these men, women, and families are living in.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member, I have to admit that I really did not understand until I got here how dramatically what we do here

affects, for better or for worse, in the most intimate ways, the lives of men and women and children every single day in all parts of the globe.

We are the only superpower in this world, and our capacity right now to do good in the face of starvation and disease and poverty is so great that it makes me weep with frustration that we are doing so little. But I am truly overwhelmed by the audacity that we would use our great power to require the clinics like we saw, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), to certify that they will not, with their own non-U.S. dollars, conduct any activity related to abortions so that they can control their own families and take care of the children that they have.

It is on behalf of those men and women and children that I urge support for the motion to strike.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a woman who has been fighting for equal opportunity, democracy in the United States and around the world, and who understands the importance of striking this antidemocratic amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I ask Members to stand back for a moment from the gag rule. Seldom have so many violations of cardinal American principles, which enjoy overwhelming support and respect in our own country, been embodied in one law.

Look at what is at stake here: free speech, female and family sexual autonomy, baseline protection of pregnant women and the most vulnerable children, reduction of abortions around the world. It is impossible to believe that any American would force on foreigners what no Member could or would do in our own country.

The direct effect between suppression of speech and its effects is not always apparent. We must not allow this cut-off-your-nose-to-spite-your-face gag rule to reap what it will sow in maternal and infant deaths, high-risk and unintentional pregnancies, escalated and unnecessary rates of abortion.

Support American principles, vote for the Greenwood-Lowe amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished Member of the Committee on the Judiciary who truly understands that we cannot do unto others what we would not do unto our own NGOs at home.

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill would place an international gag rule on organizations that use their own non-U.S. supplied funds to provide abortion services, or even to refer people or to mention abortion services.

The American people support family planning and realize that it is necessary, successful, and addresses a critical need. Nearly 600,000 women a year die of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth, and more than 150 million married women in the developing world want contraceptives but have no access to them. International family planning efforts have been remarkably successful and have saved women's lives, improved women's health, and reduced poverty.

It is shocking that proponents of the so-called Mexico industry restrictions claim that these family planning programs increase the number of abortions when, in fact, it is clear that these efforts have prevented more than 500 million unintended pregnancies. The Mexico City restrictions are pernicious, unnecessary, and harmful. They would severely limit family planning efforts and result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions. They are a clear restriction on free speech which we would never tolerate in this country. Why should America export restrictions on free speech?

Mr. Chairman, this bill would place an international gag rule on organizations that use their own non-U.S. funds to provide abortion services. This policy is clearly unacceptable, and is not supported by the President or by the American people. Last year, in a repugnant effort that held UN dues payments hostage to family planning restrictions, we were forced into an unworkable compromise. We cannot allow this to happen again. We must remain strong and oppose the global gag rule that threatens women's lives.

The American people support family planning and realize that it is necessary, successful, and addresses a critical need. According to the World Health Organization, nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth, and more than 150 million married women in the developing world want contraceptives, but have no access to them.

International family planning efforts have been remarkably successful and have saved women's lives improved women's health, and helped reduce poverty. I am shocked that proponents of these so-called "Mexico City" restrictions claim that our family planning programs, increase the number of abortions, when, in fact, studies show that these efforts have prevented more than 500 million unintended pregnancies.

There is no need to impose this type of gag rule on organizations that use their own money to further their objectives and to make women's lives safer. The "Mexico City" restrictions are pernicious, unnecessary, and harmful. They severely limit family planning efforts and result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions. They are a clear restriction on free speech. What an American export. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if the only remaining speaker will be the gentleman from